

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 384 952

EA 026 816

AUTHOR Robertson, Peter J.; Briggs, Kerri L.
TITLE The Impact of School-Based Management on Educators' Role Attitudes and Behaviors.
PUB DATE Apr 95
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 18-22, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Behavior; Behavior Patterns; *Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; *Informal Leadership; *Leadership; Leadership Qualities; *Participative Decision Making; *School Based Management; Teacher Behavior
IDENTIFIERS Australia (Victoria); United States

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the effects that the adoption of school-based management (SBM) and subsequent efforts to generate curriculum and instructional reforms have on school staff members. Specifically, it explores the leadership behaviors exhibited by administrators, faculty, and staff in 17 elementary and secondary schools from eight locations. Seven of these districts are in the United States and one is in Victoria, Australia. All schools had used SBM techniques to implement curriculum and instructional innovations. To assess the validity of the premise that certain leadership activities facilitate a school's efforts to implement significant reform, the study compared schools that had been relatively successful in generating meaningful innovations (high innovators) with schools that had been relatively less successful (low innovators). Interviews were conducted with approximately 18 staff members at each of the 8 secondary and 9 elementary schools. Leadership behaviors required for effective organizational leadership were analyzed using a model of developmental leadership, which focused on the development of five key areas--vision, commitment, teams, individuals, and opportunity. The schools that exhibited more extensive innovations showed more evidence of people engaging in behaviors associated with developmental leadership. Leadership and power can and should be shared among many formal and informal leaders. Leadership training, therefore, should be expanded within schools. Contains 55 references. (LMI)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
* from the original document.

The Impact of School-Based Management on Educators' Role Attitudes and Behaviors

Peter J. Robertson

School of Public Administration

University of Southern California

and

Kerri L. Briggs

School of Education

University of Southern California

Presented at the

American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting

April 20, 1995

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OEI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Briggs

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the leadership behaviors exhibited by administrators, faculty and staff in 17 schools. These schools included elementary and high schools that were successful in implementing curriculum and instructional innovations and some that were less successful. Interviews of school staff were conducted at an average of 18 people per school. Leadership behaviors required for effective organizational leadership were analyzed using a model of developmental leadership. Specifically, we focus on five key activities: developing a vision, developing commitment, developing teams, developing individuals, and developing opportunity. In conclusion, the schools exhibiting more extensive innovations also had more evidence of people engaging in behaviors associated with developmental leadership.

The Impact of School-Based Management on Educators' Role Attitudes and Behaviors

The purpose of this paper is to examine the effects that the adoption of school-based management, and subsequent efforts to generate curriculum and instructional reforms, have on school staff members. The analysis is based on interview data from seventeen schools -- eight secondary and nine elementary -- that were selected for study because they were at the forefront of the reform movement in districts that had made considerable headway in moving towards school-based management. While our original intent was to explore a full range of attitudinal and behavioral reactions to their schools' reform efforts, the data provided only limited information regarding such changes. Therefore, we have chosen to explore in greater depth the evidence regarding the leadership behaviors exhibited by the staff at these schools. In this introductory section, we briefly address the types of role changes explicitly identified by the respondents in our study. We then provide some initial comments regarding our perspective on the nature of leadership in organizations. This serves as background to an explication of the model of leadership we use to assess the leadership behaviors found in the schools in this study.

In our interviews with teachers and administrators, we specifically asked respondents to identify the impact that school-based management was having on the members of the staff at their school. We had hoped that the answers to these questions would provide a good picture of the kinds of attitudinal and behavior changes taking place. Instead, most of the responses fell into one of four categories. First, many individuals, especially those that had not become very involved in the reform process, indicated that school-based management and the innovations it generated had little or no impact on them as an individual. Second, many staff members pointed out that their workload had increased considerably and that this increased their level of stress or frustration. Third, there was frequent expression of appreciation for the opportunity to be involved in school-decision making. Finally, many expressed excitement over the opportunity to learn new approaches and utilize them to facilitate student learning. These responses weren't necessarily mutually exclusive. Quite a few respondents indicated that there were both pleased by their new opportunities and stressed by the additional workload.

While these reactions are not unimportant, they do not reflect significant changes in how staff members conceive of their roles. For example, most teachers continue to view their role primarily in terms of activities directly related to the teaching function. While many have improved their skills and adopted new practices, these changes reflect efforts to increase their effectiveness in the teacher role. Furthermore, teaching is still seen as a largely independent task, albeit one that can be facilitated by collaborating better with other teachers. It is much less common that teachers have broadened their definition of their role to incorporate aspects of other roles such as leader or change agent. This is not to say that no one had adopted behaviors reflecting an expanded role orientation. In reality, many staff members had become very active in the process of introducing new ideas to the school and motivating others to use them. In essence, these individuals were taking on leadership or change agent responsibilities without necessarily recognizing it as such.

Our perspective is that successful reform efforts at a school require a wide range of people to take on more leadership responsibilities. Therefore, although evidence regarding shifts in role conceptions was limited, we wanted to explore the extent to which there had been changes in the nature of the leadership at these schools. We were particularly interested in two aspects of leadership. First, who was taking on leadership responsibilities, and second, what kinds of leadership activities were they adopting? The first of these issues can be addressed here. The second issue is the focus of the remainder of the paper.

The respondents in our study were asked to identify the leaders at their school. By far, the majority of the answers mentioned individuals who held formal positions most readily identified as leadership positions, namely, principals, assistant principals, department heads, and counselors. In addition to these individuals, it was not uncommon for a few teachers at a school to be identified as leaders as well. Typically, this was because they had taken considerable initiative in facilitating the reform process, working either as a key member in the governance of the school or as a champion of one or more programmatic, curriculum, or instructional reforms. Individuals in the former group were usually viewed as leaders as much because of their position as because of their

actions. The individuals in the latter group were informal leaders, designated as such because of their willingness to take on additional responsibilities and their effectiveness in doing so.

We believe that these answers reflect commonly held perceptions regarding organizational leadership, namely, that leadership is primarily limited to the formal leaders of the organization with the exception of a few informal leaders who stand out among their peers. It is our contention, however, that this perspective on leadership is more limiting than it needs to be. Responsibility for organizational leadership should not rest with a limited number of members. Many people throughout the organization, at all levels, can and should engage in leadership activities. Formal leaders should help to make sure that a wide array of individuals become informal leaders. To the extent that performance of these leadership activities diffuses throughout the membership, the organization benefits from more *total* leadership. Ultimately, this increases the likelihood that the organization's leadership requirements are effectively addressed.

This leads to a consideration of the second issue. If individuals throughout the organization should contribute to its leadership, what leadership activities are necessary or valuable? We asked respondents to describe the approaches to leadership being utilized in these schools. Descriptions of the principal's leadership (even by the principals themselves) were usually fairly limited, oftentimes relying on brief characterizations of the particular style s/he utilized, such as facilitator-coach, supportive, managerial, or strong instructional leader. There was less focus on particular types of activities or behaviors the principals used to exert leadership. Likewise, when explaining why other individuals, especially those without formal leadership positions, were seen as leaders, respondents frequently indicated that it was because they "took the lead" in one particular area or another. All in all, the responses to these particular questions did not yield considerable information regarding the leadership activities at these schools.

Given these limitations, we have chosen to examine our data to look for evidence of a broader range of leadership activities that could, and we believe should, be taking place at schools in the throes of an attempt to bring about major reform. The activities of interest are outlined below, comprising what we refer to as a model of developmental leadership. The assumptions

underlying this model are 1) that discussions of effective leadership should focus on the various behaviors or activities which leaders should exhibit, rather than particular styles or orientations they should adopt, and 2) that leadership, as reflected by these behaviors and activities, can be exerted by anyone in the organization, not just those individuals who hold formal leadership positions or are most readily identified as informal leaders. We do not claim that the categories of activities comprising this model constitute a comprehensive set of leadership behaviors. There are certainly a host of other administrative, managerial, facilitative, and interpersonal tasks that must be addressed if an organization is to be effective. However, we do believe that this model of leadership entails the critical activities needed to bring about major organization reform and to build and maintain a high-performing system. Furthermore, this model is consistent with the basic ideas underlying the "high involvement management" orientation that has guided our previous analyses of these data (Mohrman, Wohlstetter, & Associates, 1994; Robertson, Wohlstetter, & Mohrman, forthcoming; Wohlstetter, Smyer, & Mohrman, 1994).

A Model of Developmental Leadership

As organizations strive to empower their members and increase their involvement in the process of organizational reform, new approaches to leadership that support these efforts must be adopted. Literature on leadership contains a number of recommendations regarding leadership styles and approaches required for success in these organizations. In this section, we outline a model of leadership that synthesizes many of the key ideas found in this literature. We refer to this model as developmental leadership, and we focus on five key activities required for effective organizational leadership: developing a vision, developing commitment, developing teams, developing individuals, and developing opportunity. Each of these is described in detail below, drawing first on literature regarding organizational leadership in general and then on literature regarding leadership in schools.

Vision. One of the most frequent assertions in recent writing on leadership is the need for leaders to identify or clarify a guiding vision for the organization (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Bryson & Crosby, 1992; Conger & Kanungo, 1987; Kouzes & Posner, 1987; Tichy & Devanna, 1986).

The articulation of a vision helps to define the path the organization should be following (Leavitt, 1986) and provides a foundation for maintaining coherence among its many activities. On one hand, a vision is important for effective organizational change. Development of a vision is a key component of the transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978) needed to bring about significant organizational renewal. Vision can also serve to guide and coordinate the many specific changes needed to generate systemic organizational change (Porras & Robertson, 1992). On the other hand, evidence suggests that an effective vision is also instrumental for insuring organizational stability, resiliency, and long-term success (Collins & Porras, 1994). For example, a group of visionary organizations has outperformed a comparable group of good organizations by over 600 percent (calculated in terms of stock returns) over the last sixty years.

While leaders in a large number of organizations have attempted to develop a meaningful organizational vision, many have found that the concept is quite ambiguous and thus hard to operationalize. According to Collins and Porras (1989), two distinct elements together comprise a vision. The first is an articulation of the organization's purpose, or fundamental set of reasons for its existence, which is broad, enduring, inspirational, and provides a clear sense of direction for the organization and its members. The second is an organizational mission, which is a specific, risky but achievable goal, driven by the statement of purpose, that has a defined point of completion and provides a motivational point of focus for organizational activities. While purpose and mission clarify the vision for the organization as a whole, it is important that the vision then serves to guide the definition of objectives for organizational subunits as well. Middle managers should develop an overarching goal that is feasible yet challenging, reflects the core purpose of the department, and has larger significance (Bradford & Cohen, 1984). To the extent possible, leaders at successively lower levels of the organization also need to clarify how the goals and activities of members are tied to and contribute to the achievement of the overall organizational vision. This will help to insure that the vision has real potential to provide a meaningful frame of reference for all members of the organization.

Commitment. The development of a vision will not benefit the organization unless it truly serves to motivate and guide members' behavior. Thus, it is important that leaders take steps to develop member commitment to the vision and the values it reflects. First and foremost, they need to communicate and reinforce the central and dominant role of the vision at every opportunity (Peters & Waterman, 1982). They should repeatedly refer to the vision and values on relevant occasions and demonstrate that these will be used as the basis for decisions and actions within the organization (Bennis & Nanus, 1985). In particular, the vision and values should influence what leaders pay attention to, measure, and control as well as who is rewarded or punished and why (Schein, 1992). Leaders' behavior must also be consistent with the vision (Kouzes & Posner, 1987), as any hypocrisy will be readily noted and used by members to discount the significance of the vision. Leaders must react to critical organizational incidents in ways that support the vision, to indicate that it retains its importance even under difficult circumstances (Schein, 1992).

Leaders also need to build an organizational culture that reflects and reinforces the organization's vision, as strong cultures help to generate commitment among organizational members (Siehl & Martin, 1983). While the activities noted above can contribute to culture-building, leaders can enhance the effectiveness of their efforts by explicitly managing the symbolic aspects of the organization (Pfeffer, 1980; Smircich & Morgan, 1992). For example, they can communicate the organization's vision and values through such means as rituals and ceremonies, stories, language, and other symbols (Deal & Kennedy, 1982; Trice & Beyer, 1993). They can also strengthen the culture and increase commitment levels by selecting new organizational members who already share the organization's values and by utilizing socialization processes to help instill these values in newcomers (Robertson & Tang, 1995; Van Maanen & Schein, 1979).

Teams. Commitment by organizational members to the organizational vision and values helps to insure that they are all oriented toward the same basic purposes and objectives. However, this does not automatically resolve the organization's need to effectively coordinate the activities of interdependent members. More and more, organizations are relying heavily on a variety of different types of teams and groups as a primary locus of activity (Drucker, 1988) and a key

mechanism through which coordination occurs across various internal boundaries (e.g., functional and hierarchical). Hence, the third task of leadership is to develop effective teams so as to enhance the extent to which members can successfully coordinate and integrate their activities toward the accomplishment of the organization's vision and objectives (Mohrman, 1993). Successful development of high-performing teams is, increasingly, a key prerequisite to a high level of organizational performance. Furthermore, effective use of teams that provide meaningful opportunities for participation in decision making serves as a critical vehicle through which organizations can increase employee empowerment and involvement in the process of reform (Cohen, 1993).

The requirements for leading groups, in terms of the managerial skills needed as well as the group and organizational factors and issues that must be addressed, are considerable (Gladstein, 1984; Hackman & Walton, 1986). For example, leaders must make sure that characteristics of the group (e.g., structure, composition, goals, and norms), its members (e.g., knowledge and skills, level of effort, and performance strategies) and the organizational context (e.g., resources, reward system, information system) are appropriate for the task at hand. Furthermore, since leaders often make the mistake of managing members of groups as individuals rather than as a team (Hackman, 1990), it is useful for leaders to work towards developing "shared responsibility teams" (Bradford & Cohen, 1984). In this orientation, leaders use groups to make decisions regarding key organizational issues (including those typically thought of as managerial concerns), relying on a consensus-based, joint leader-member decision making style. In addition, they pay careful attention to how the team is working, facilitate the interaction process, and develop in the group a feeling of responsibility for using effective problem solving processes. The result is the development of teams in which members feel a shared responsibility for achieving the overarching goals of the team as a whole, rather than adopting an individual orientation in which they focus on their own personal objectives and performance.

Individuals. Effective leadership also requires an emphasis on developing the skills and abilities of individual organizational members. As organizations strive to take better advantage of

their human resources by increasing member involvement in decision making processes and utilizing more of their full potential toward the achievement of organizational goals, it is critical that more attention be given to the task of updating and expanding the skills and abilities they are being called upon to contribute. For example, Berlew (1974) points out that charismatic leadership requires a managerial orientation that strengthens subordinates. Likewise, the key premise of the post-heroic style of management outlined by Bradford and Cohen (1984) is that managers should make decisions and solve problems in ways that further the development of their subordinates. Hackman and Walton (1986) suggest that a primary measure of group effectiveness is that members' experiences in the group further develops their capabilities.

An emphasis on developing the skills and abilities of organizational members requires leaders to adopt a coaching or mentoring role. Senge (1990) indicates that leaders are responsible for enabling people to continually expand their capabilities to understand complexity, clarify vision, and improve shared mental models. The focus here should be not only on the technical capabilities members need to carry out their particular job or role. Instead, leaders should strive to develop a full range of interpersonal, problem solving, and managerial skills in their employees as well (Lawler, 1986). Ultimately, leaders must help turn their followers into leaders as well (Burns, 1978), thus expanding the organization's total leadership capacity. This approach reflects an emphasis on empowerment that goes well beyond mere "participation" in decision making. Instead, it suggests a concerted effort to insure that members realize their full potential and that they are able to exert meaningful influence over important organizational decisions.

Opportunity. Finally, leaders must work to insure that the organization and its members, as individuals and as teams, have sufficient opportunity to effectively carry out the activities required for organizational success. Towards this end, the development of opportunity can entail a number of different activities. Internally, it means designing an organization that facilitates rather than impedes members efforts to perform well and to generate valuable reforms. For example, leaders should align administrative arrangements, operating procedures, and personnel policies with the organization's values (Bryson & Crosby, 1992), and remove unnecessary constraints

(e.g., outdated or extraneous procedures and policies) that get in the way of effective performance (Kouzes & Posner, 1987). They must make sure that members are provided with the resources necessary to do their work (Bryson & Crosby, 1992). They should also "manage upward," influencing decisions regarding schedules, budgets, space, and time being made by those at higher levels of the hierarchy, so as to protect their people and their area of responsibility (Sayles, 1989). All in all, leaders should strive to provide their members with a level of autonomy and discretion that will give them the opportunity to fully utilize their competencies.

The development of opportunity for the organization as a whole requires leaders to effectively manage the external interface with the environment. In general, leaders need to adopt appropriate buffering strategies that protect the organization from environmental uncertainty and bridging strategies that enhance its security in terms of safety, survival, and an improved bargaining position (Scott, 1981). More specifically, they should act to insure that the organization continues to acquire the inputs needed to carry out its activities (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). This may include monitoring the environment (Mintzberg, 1973) to assess potential problems and opportunities facing the organization, and seeking out opportunities to generate additional resources that will expand the organization's capacity. They should also strive to maintain the organization's legitimacy, so as to assure continued public support for its activities (Meyer & Rowan, 1977). The development of stable community relations (Bryson & Crosby, 1992) and the establishment of meaningful linkages with key external stakeholders should facilitate this process.

Developmental Leadership in Schools

Vision. Discussions of leadership required to bring about reform in schools and/or to generate effective school performance identify similar factors as those outlined above in the developmental model of leadership. First, it is frequently noted that leaders should clarify the school's purpose, articulate its vision, shape its mission, promote a distinctive set of values, and identify key school goals (Cuban, 1988; Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990; Murphy & Beck, 1994; Short & Spencer, 1990). This is seen as an important component of instructional leadership (Heck & Marcoulides, 1990) as well as a critical element of transformational leadership in schools

(Leithwood, 1992). Cuban (1988) suggests that the school vision should be clear and understood, aligned with the followers' aspirations, flexible and modifiable by followers, and anchored in a set of ethical values. Development of a purpose and vision for the school can assist it in maintaining a broad perspective (Murphy, 1994), facilitate the processes of problem-finding (Peterson, 1986) and strategic planning (Hallinger & McCary, 1990), and help to insure that members follow the vision rather than a particular leader (Sergiovanni, 1992).

Commitment. The importance of educational leaders generating commitment to the school's vision and values has also been readily noted. For example, Murphy and Beck (1994) discuss the "leader as servant," who reveals his or her commitment to shared purposes and inspires similar trust and commitment in others, while Leithwood (1992) points out that transformational leaders renew staff commitment to the school. Various mechanisms for building commitment among members are identified in the literature. It is important for leaders to create and manage a school culture that supports the vision and values (Fullan, 1992), which is facilitated by their efforts to design rituals and daily mechanisms that make the mission and culture tangible (Cuban, 1988). They need to readily communicate the vision to stakeholders and then monitor the school's performance (Short & Spencer, 1990) and create reward or incentive systems that establish positive expectations and standards, inspire subordinates, acknowledge good work, and reinforce desired behavior (Heck et al., 1990; Murphy, 1989; Sergiovanni, 1992). Leaders need to support the school vision by using it as a guide for decisions regarding the acquisition and distribution of resources (Hall, 1988; Murphy, 1994). Furthermore, leaders' actions, even those that are trivial and routine, should be coordinated, consistent, and purposeful, geared toward moving the school forward to achieve its purposes (Hallinger & McCary, 1990). Leaders need to model those behaviors that will motivate followers to achieve school goals (Cuban, 1988). Sergiovanni (1990; 1992) suggests that, by elevating school goals and purposes to the level of a shared covenant that bonds members together in a common cause, leaders can develop self-motivation and self-management among members that diminish the need for direct leadership.

Teams. Literature on educational leadership has given somewhat less attention to the importance of developing effective teams within schools, but there is recognition that this is a significant task of effective school leaders. For example, Reitzug (1992) points out that a primary function of the leader role is to hold various groups of teachers together and facilitate coordination between these groups. To enhance the effectiveness of these groups, leaders should encourage them to review the contributions of group members with the goal of full participation, help them learn how to develop and share their skills and work together, and help the group address key questions competently. The ultimate goal is to help groups become self-reliant in their discussions and decision making, such that teachers become responsible for school leadership via participation in these groups. Murphy (1994) also points out that leaders can create and utilize informal groups that help develop a collaborative school culture and support teacher success. This happens more readily as leaders cultivate a network of teacher relationships, develop groups of people who can work effectively, give these groups meaningful assignments, create internal support structures that reduce teacher isolation, share authority by working in collaborative, cooperative decision making processes, and participate in team meetings as a member, not as a leader, modeling collaborative behaviors. Since effective use of teams at a school can help implement desired changes (Hall, 1988), leaders should strive to develop a collaborative culture that will enable staff to deal with the multiple innovations that are often introduced at the school simultaneously (Fullan, 1992). Ultimately, the nature and quality of the grouping of teachers at the school can shape the types of learning experiences offered to students (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982), and evidence suggests that leaders in high-performing schools involve teachers in decision making to a greater extent than those in low-performing schools (Hleck et al., 1990).

Individuals. In addition to developing effective teams, part of the educational leader's role as described in the literature is to focus on the personal development of individual members of the staff. Typically, the primary emphasis has been on the development of teachers' instructional skills (Short & Spencer, 1990). For example, leaders are supposed to help teachers improve the use of pedagogy, subject matter quality, and classroom management (Cuban, 1988), supervise

how instructional strategies are transformed into learning activities, with follow-up feedback to help teachers improve (Heck et al., 1990), and encourage observation among teachers and assist them in their classes (Murphy, 1994). These activities have been viewed as a key aspect of the instructional role of school leaders. Beyond instructional improvement, however, there is recognition that leaders should be oriented toward the broader development of their staff members' capabilities. Hallinger and Richardson (1988) suggest that teachers need the opportunity to learn new skills that will enable them to implement changes in policy and practice. Leithwood (1992) argues that transformational leaders foster teacher development and help them solve problems more effectively. Sergiovanni (1990) goes a step further, claiming that transformative leadership entails a focus on arousing human potential and satisfying higher-order needs, in part by developing the leadership capabilities of others. Likewise, Murphy (1994) indicates that promoting teacher success requires the cultivation of teacher leadership and the delegation of leadership responsibilities.

Opportunity. Finally, the literature acknowledges the importance of leaders -- whether they be instructional, transformational, or managerial -- creating an environment that increases the opportunities for staff and the school as a whole to perform at a high level. This requires an emphasis on effective design and management of the school organization and the interactions between the school and the environment. For example, leaders should work with stakeholders to develop structures, policies, and processes that enable the school to perform well (Murphy & Beck, 1994), designing the system to facilitate goal accomplishment (Leithwood, 1992). This includes the establishment of a safe, orderly, stable environment that provides a positive climate for learning and allows effective instruction to occur (Heck et al., 1990; Short & Spencer, 1990). In essence, leaders should construct the conditions under which the vision can materialize by linking organizational routines to the school's mission (Cuban, 1988). It is also important for leaders to reduce the organizational constraints that decrease time-on-task, by buffering classrooms, protecting teachers from additional district paper work, helping them navigate through the school bureaucracy, controlling externally-produced interruptions to the core technical activities of

instruction, and providing necessary inputs (Bossert et al., 1992; Cuban, 1988; Murphy, 1994). Leaders should focus on a purposeful coordination and effective utilization of existing resources (Hallinger & McCary, 1990; Murphy, 1994), as well as on the generation of additional resources such as externally-funded grants and links between the school and the home and community (Cuban, 1988; Murphy, 1989). Lastly, leaders need to manage the political relationship of the school to its environment (Heck et al., 1990), build coalitions, spread the message of the school, and improve community support for the school (Cuban, 1988).

Methods

The sample for this study consisted of seventeen schools from eight locations. Seven of these are districts in the U.S., including: Bellevue, Washington; Chicago, Illinois; Denver, Colorado; Jefferson County, Kentucky; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Rochester, New York; and Sweetwater, California. One high school and one elementary school were included from each of these districts except for Sweetwater, which is a high school district. The eighth location was Victoria, Australia, from which two high schools and two elementary schools were included. These venues were selected because of their reputation for having strong school-based management plans, including significant decision making authority at the school level. Phone calls were made to district officials to verify the strength of their decentralization plans. The specific schools studied in each site were selected based on information provided by district officials and/or researchers familiar with the site that significant curriculum and/or instructional reforms were underway at these schools. The intent was to include exemplary schools in the sample so as to enhance the likelihood that such reforms would in fact be found.

Prior to beginning data collection, all members of the research team involved in this study attended a two day training session. Two members of this team visited each school for two days, during which data were collected through structured interviews. Interviews focusing on school-based management and school innovations in curriculum and instruction were held with administrators, teachers, community members, and (at high schools) students. Included in the set of interviewees were members of the governance council and other participative structures.

department heads, the union representative, teachers who have been actively involved in the design, adoption, and/or use of innovative practices, and teachers who have not been involved in the innovations at the school. The number of interviews conducted at the schools ranged from 13 to 24, with an average of 18. Interviews typically lasted forty-five minutes to an hour.

Responses from all interviewees at a given school were aggregated into a textual data set that provided a thorough description of the various structures and processes associated with school-based management and the efforts to implement curriculum and instructional reform at that school. These seventeen data sets were examined for evidence regarding the five categories of developmental leadership activities described above, using the specific types of activities identified in each category as guidelines. In an attempt to assess the validity of our premise that these leadership activities facilitate a school's efforts to implement significant reform, we compared the evidence from schools that had been relatively successful in generating meaningful innovations to the evidence from schools that, to date, had been relatively less successful. This differentiation between what we refer to as the high innovator and the low innovator schools was based on analyses conducted previously and described elsewhere (Robertson et al., forthcoming). In general, we did find greater evidence of these leadership activities in the high innovator schools. Below, we discuss the primary patterns from our analysis and provide examples of the five categories of leadership activities exhibited at these schools.

Findings

Developing Vision

All of the schools we examined had some sort of a vision, mission statement, or set of goals and objectives. Thus, it appears that leaders at all of these schools recognize the importance of a school vision and have put at least some effort into developing one. However, there was considerable variation among the schools regarding how the vision was created and who was involved. For example, the development of a vision may have been the work of the principal, a group of teachers and the principal, subcommittees, or the entire school. Some leaders annually organized the entire faculty to plan and consider school goals for the year ahead. Another school

revises their vision through subcommittees -- the school improvement group, organizational development group, and the measurement and assessment group -- with the principal overseeing the process. At two schools, the vision was created by a group of teachers and administrators before the school actually opened. Other schools adopted externally generated goals such as those provided by the Kentucky Education Reform Act or their district instructional frameworks.

While some form of vision was consistently in place, one difference between the high and low innovator schools centered around the purpose of the vision. Ideally, a vision statement should define goals for the schools that are challenging and motivational. In the high innovator schools, this was the case most of the time. The vision statements in these schools provided a focus, clarified goals, prioritized efforts, and created a shared purpose among school members. For example, leaders at one high school with a deeply held belief about teacher empowerment used their vision and purpose as a recruiting device for both faculty and students -- people who came to that school already knew that this was a key emphasis. In the midst of conflicting signals from district and school people, the principal at an elementary school brought staff and parents together to decide upon three goals to pursue along with solutions and directions for achieving those goals. In contrast, members of the low innovator schools could often acknowledge the existence of a vision, but it was often vague, incoherent, not focused on specific goals, or not a "living" document. Teachers and administrators at some of these schools remembered developing a vision a few years ago, but there appeared to be little use of that vision in practice.

Another distinguishing factor between the high and low innovator schools was in terms of how the vision was used. Evidence from the high innovator schools suggests that the vision is effective only if all of the staff view it as a device that shapes goals and helps guide decision making. Leaders at many high innovator elementary schools generated a vision to be a "developmental community school" or have a "child-centered curriculum," and their efforts were consistently targeted towards living up to such labels. At other schools, key decisions coming out of the school-based management council and/or school committees were made within the parameters defined by the school vision or mission. In other words, the high innovator schools

often used their visions as a frame of reference -- decisions about curriculum, instruction, operations and other issues were aligned with these visions. This was generally not true at the low innovator schools, where the vision did not explicitly guide the actions of leaders, staff, classroom activities, or council decisions.

Developing Commitment

While there was some evidence of leaders' efforts to develop commitment among the members of these schools, this category of activities was less prominent than the other elements of the developmental leadership model. Furthermore, with few exceptions, it was the principals of the high innovator schools who worked hard to generate commitment. In the low innovator schools, efforts to develop *school-wide* commitment to the vision or any of the improvement efforts were infrequent. Leadership behaviors oriented toward generating shared commitment reflected three primary themes -- communicating the vision, reinforcing it through actions, and strengthening the school culture.

Frequently communicating the school's vision and values to school members is a valuable means for reinforcing its importance. Leaders at some of the high innovator schools made a conscious effort to communicate the school's vision at every opportunity. In so doing, they help to keep the vision in the forefront of members' minds and thus increase their belief in its significance. For example, by repeatedly communicating the idea that every teacher and staff member is important to making the school run, one principal assisted the staff in achieving their outcome objectives. Another principal readily expressed his expectations and vision for the school -- which focused on the value of collegiality -- such that teachers knew they were expected to work together and communicate with each other. In contrast, leaders at low innovator schools who had a vision for the school were not always adept at communicating it to others. In these schools, the vision was sometimes tied too closely to the principal (and perhaps a few other people) or it was imposed from outside the school, but it was usually not shared by the entire school. The leaders in these situations failed in the basic task of ensuring that the vision fits the school and is adopted by the staff.

The development of commitment is also a function of the leaders' reinforcement of the school's vision through actions and decisions. In most of the high innovator schools, the vision was exercised continuously and consistently. For example, one elementary school principal reinforced the school's vision of sharing power through teams at every opportunity. Another principal reinforced the school's vision and its value of focusing on students by discontinuing his work as a mentor for other district principals so that he could spend more time at the school working with faculty and students. A few schools were facing extreme pressure to meet certain academic thresholds or to generate results from the use of grant money. Principals in these schools communicated these pressures to the staff and encouraged them to adopt new practices that would meet these demands. Leaders in the low innovator schools did not reinforce the vision to the same degree. One school council made a critical decision that impacted the entire direction of the school without the knowledge of the entire faculty, and then they failed to communicate that decision to the faculty. In other cases, principals sometimes disregarded decisions that previously had been agreed upon by the council or staff as a whole. For example, a high school faculty facing extreme budget cuts negotiated their fall teaching load in the spring only to find later that the deal had been unilaterally changed by the principal over the summer. In situations such as these, staff commitment to the vision, and to the school's reform efforts, usually existed only among a few people.

In the high innovator schools, leadership behaviors associated with developing commitment often centered around strengthening the school culture. Principals and sometimes teachers were credited with building a culture that supported the school's vision. Leaders at one school involved with the Schools for the 21st Century program utilized this symbol as a metaphor for continual improvement and progress. At a high school with a vision of teacher empowerment, all teachers were an instrumental part of the main decision making body and new faculty were chosen who agreed with the school's values. This practice of hiring new faculty who already bought in to the school's vision actually occurred at several schools, and it had the effect of reinforcing the whole faculty's commitment to the school.

Developing Teams

Teams of people working together to achieve a task or work towards meeting a goal were a common theme in all of our sample schools. Examples of the teams created are grade-level teams, a core planning team, the school-based management council, council subcommittees, additional committees, task forces, study groups, parent groups, and departments. Generally, these teams are mechanisms for generating involvement at the school. Two differences between these teams at high innovator schools and low innovator schools are the purpose for which these teams were created and how leaders help or hinder the teams' effectiveness.

At most of the high innovator schools, the general purpose of the teams was to share the responsibility of operating the school or to share leadership. Ideas generated in these groups often provided valuable direction regarding the achievement of school goals. One school relied on its committees to such a great extent that, along with the principal, the committee members were considered key school leaders. We also found evidence in these schools of leaders developing shared responsibility teams by delegating meaningful decisions to these groups. One elementary school principal delegated initial hiring decisions to the personnel committee, school policy recommendations came from the discipline committee, and decisions about teaching and learning are made in the grade level teams and subject matter teams. Another principal viewed her role as one of challenging the groups to achieve their goals, but not to lead the groups. For example, she requested that the curriculum group outline their goals, explain why they chose those goals, and identify expected outcomes, but otherwise did not shape their decisions. An elementary school council created temporary committees to deal with critical, discrete tasks (e.g., an ad hoc technology and science committee worked on integrating technology into the curriculum). Through these teams, then, more teachers are involved in school decision making and more people are afforded leadership opportunities.

Various developmental leadership actions helped these teams perform better and get things accomplished. To help develop these teams into effective groups, leaders often provided or conducted various training sessions about group processes such as decision making or achieving

consensus. There were also occasions on which leaders facilitated group effectiveness by paying explicit attention to the composition of the teams. For example, rather than simply having people volunteer for group assignments, some principals focused on putting teams together with people who had complementary skills or who shared similar philosophies about schooling. The use of grade-level teams at one school, in addition to making curriculum and instruction decisions, helped the less experienced teachers by joining them with veteran teachers. To provide additional support, principals at the high innovator schools provided meeting times for teams, gave people information to make decisions, established parameters for operating, and coordinated activities across the groups. Since some of the schools had up to ten different committees and various grade-level teams, it was also important for principals to coordinate their activities and oversee their decisions to ensure that there were no contradictions. This coordination and oversight role was sometimes conducted through the main decision making body or school-based management council.

Not all the work groups or teams in the high innovator schools were problem-free. For example, problems arose in some schools when teams were too cohesive. One principal mentioned that she had to work to keep the groups from becoming too exclusive and fragmented. However, teams utilized at the low innovator schools were usually even less effective. Problems with the use of teams in these schools centered around two issues: power sharing and decision making. For shared responsibility teams to develop, it is important that they be given sufficient authority either to make decisions or to generate recommendations that will actually be addressed. In the low innovator schools, principals often made decisions without the input of various groups, a principal or chair controlled the agenda and kept others from voicing their concerns, or the principal did not share authority with the groups. When the work of groups was subverted or suppressed in these ways, the willingness of teachers, staff, and parents to contribute was decreased. The process of decision making in these groups was also frequently difficult. Teams could often not come to consensus, or decisions were made by a few individuals before the actual team meeting. Some teachers were frustrated with the slowness of the group decision making process. Other teachers did not want to make decisions and preferred principal direction.

Developing Individuals

The bulk of leadership activity directed at developing individuals is found in the provision of professional development and the mentoring or supervisory role. Training activities seemed most effective when the whole school received the training (e.g., math and science workshops for an elementary school staff), when training was planned to help achieve district goals, or when teams of teachers worked together to implement ideas from the workshops. Most of the findings in this area focus on how skills are improved and on the leadership role in that process. Differences between high and low innovator schools were evident in how the skills and abilities of individuals are developed, in the supervision of individuals, and in who besides the principal is exerting leadership.

At the high innovator schools, individual skills and abilities were developed through the attendance of conferences and workshops. Sometimes the principal provided information, and arrangements were often made for teachers to attend various developmental activities. For example, a principal provided instructional resources for teachers to experiment with new instructional methods. Additionally, to help keep faculty informed, principals readily provided them with information about current happenings in education and about new techniques. Among the low innovator schools, there was either a lack of professional development or the professional development that was available was merely fulfilling a requirement, instead of focusing on particular needs. With the former, some of the council members had received training in the beginning, but there was no additional training as the council membership changed. In reference to the latter, there was often no professional development focused on teaching differently, even in cases where teachers wanted to change their instructional methods.

The mentoring and supervisory role for leaders, especially principals, was critical in the high innovator schools. This included monitoring curriculum and pedagogy, evaluating teaching on a regular basis, and challenging teachers to try new techniques. Principals monitored individual progress toward meeting goals by looking at teacher portfolios or lessons. Critical to this process was the emotional and moral support of the principal as teachers became more involved in school-

wide decision making and implemented new ways of teaching. One elementary school principal mentioned the developmental aspect of leadership and that building leadership in teachers and others was a focus. Leaders who provided supervision for teachers were also important at the low innovator schools. Unfortunately, some were unable to provide this kind of leadership. One principal indicated that, because of the additional work associated with school-based management, he was too busy to support individual development. Some administrators did not value new teaching methods. One teacher, who had adopted more innovative teaching methods, recounted the story of a recent instructional evaluation. The assistant principal, upon seeing her efforts toward cooperative learning and a less-than-quiet classroom, said that he would return when the teacher was doing "real teaching". In sum, some leaders are better at helping develop the skills and abilities of teachers. Those who encourage innovation or endorse and facilitate professional development are more likely to help the development of teachers.

In the high innovator schools, examples of individuals taking on new leadership roles were found in two areas -- instruction and governance. Instructional leaders were mostly teachers who directed programs (e.g., a family resource center or new assessment procedure), organized and conducted workshops, or obtained resources for teachers. Teacher leaders initiated or implemented reforms by disseminating information and developing the skills of other teachers. Governance leaders were teachers, parents, and community members. These people helped establish school-based management, facilitated council meetings, created guidelines for council meetings, or instructed other teachers about decision making in the classroom. Sometimes these governance leaders were other administrators at the school or outside consultants who helped facilitate the process of sharing power at the school site. Through these kinds of activities, a wide range of individuals associated with the school were able to further develop their own leadership capabilities. In contrast, implementation of opportunities for professional development and expansion of leadership in the low innovator schools was often problematic. In one case, teachers resisted the training and the principal could not get them to implement any of the new ideas. While colleagues conducted professional development workshops at another school, the teachers did not

talk about it or plan to use it. As one teacher said, "some use it -- some don't." Finally, one principal provided professional development opportunities only for the teachers who had already demonstrated their willingness to be innovative.

Developing Opportunity

Generally, leaders at the schools in our sample generated many opportunities for the school and site members through such means as obtaining grant money, creating links with other organizations, and building connections with external programs. However, their efforts to develop opportunity were somewhat different in the high innovator schools than in the low innovator schools. Leader actions at the high innovator schools were aimed at supporting, improving, or changing core activities at the school (e.g., assessment, work toward achieving school goals, school-based management). Leaders in low innovator schools were less likely to focus on generating opportunities that affected the heart of the school. Most often their actions in this category addressed "add-ons" to school operations, such as a technology component that was separate from other content areas. Effective behaviors utilized by leaders to develop opportunities are discussed below in terms of their impact for individuals and for the organization.

Among the high innovator schools, leadership behaviors oriented towards creating opportunities for individuals involved getting resources for teachers and increasing parent involvement. Principals tried to provide extra time, substitutes, and money for resources during the implementation of innovations. Moreover, some teachers were given a budget to purchase instructional materials. A few principals mentioned efforts to increase parent involvement. Examples of such efforts included conducting workshops in multiple languages, opening a family resource center where families can get social services, and sending parents to represent the school at conferences.

At the organizational level, many of the high innovator schools had various grants and programs (e.g., National Alliance) in effect. The principal performed the role of writing proposals or initiating programs most often, but sometimes teachers headed up these efforts. Principals worked with the district to reduce constraints, protect turf, or increase resources. For example,

one principal requested waivers to change district regulations prescribing the number of members on the school-based management council. Another principal was involved with the district committee responsible for making the policies governing school-based management. In line with developing opportunities for individuals, one principal arranged for workshops to be conducted at the school to fulfill the teacher in-service requirements. There was a teacher whose involvement with a district assessment committee initiated changes in the school's own assessment processes.

Other leadership roles for principals included establishing links with other organizations. Seeking out help from these organizations increased the schools' own capacity to teach their students and to improve their restructuring process. School leaders looked to universities, museums, private organizations, professional associations, restructuring initiatives (e.g., Coalition of Essential Schools) for help. One principal initiated contacts that included an organizational consultant from a private company who aided with restructuring, a church that helped with science lessons and laboratory work, and a local museum that provided additional art instruction. One principal brought in external evaluators to evaluate the reform process. Principals, teachers, and councils created opportunities for teachers to visit other schools. Principals and other leaders at these schools were liaisons between the school and the environment.

There is less evidence at the low innovator schools of opportunity being developed. Moreover, the examples found frequently seem rather haphazard and only indirectly fit into the overall vision for the school. For example, a few programs were introduced by various people at some of these schools with the hope of encouraging innovation within departments (e.g., math department) or among a smaller group of students at the school (e.g., those enrolled in the magnet program). There were some individuals who felt constrained to take advantage of opportunities and others who had a sense of not really knowing what to do. One high school's year-round schedule prohibited teachers from taking advantage of professional development opportunities during the summer months. One teacher commented on having freedom to try new things, but not knowing what to do. Leaders, in these cases, had not taken actions necessary to create an

environment in which opportunities were readily available, or constraints were removed, to help school staff perform at high levels.

Like the high innovator schools, principals in low innovator schools had developed many ties with organizations outside the district. There were restructuring programs (e.g., Comer's Essential Schools; the National Alliance) to help make changes at the schools, develop ties with the community, and acquire needed grant money. One high school had developed programs with Burger King, "Cities in the Schools", the Chamber of Commerce, and the local business association. Another high school principal made it a practice to send the quarterly newsletter to members of the Chamber of Commerce and Kiwanis Club. Principals were often called upon to do public relations for the schools, and one high school hired a part time person to solely focus on community relations. However, while principals had brought in lots of grant money, external help and programs, staff behavior (e.g., instructional methods) at some of these schools was frequently left unchanged. In other schools, the sheer number of programs created a chaotic situation that inhibited the reform movement. Despite a few exceptions, many of the schools were constrained by the district, especially with issues of budget. Leaders of these low innovator schools were kept from making changes because of budget constraints and often were unable to fight budget cuts.

Conclusion

In general, the schools exhibiting more extensive curriculum and instruction innovations also had more evidence of people engaging in the five categories of leadership behavior comprising the developmental leadership model. While the data do not allow an analysis of true cause-effect relationships, it appears that the leadership behaviors we observed helped to shaped the reform process in many ways. The actions of leaders in the high innovator schools created consistency and coherence in these schools. Instead of pursuing grant opportunities just for the money, leaders made connections between opportunities and the school vision. Individuals went through professional development workshops to work more effectively with a decision making team. Commitment to improvement and good teaching got the individual through the hard times of reform. A school vision answered the eventual question - "why in the world am I working so

hard?" All in all, the approaches to leadership discussed above helped to make sense out of the chaotic process that is school reform by providing a focus for the reform effort and creating a system that encourages and allows innovation to take place.

While the specific leadership activities exhibited by the leaders in these schools seem to be valuable in terms of facilitating the reform process, just as important is the evidence that innovative schools benefited from having a wide range of people take on leadership responsibilities. A traditional perspective that the principal is the sole leader, or that only individuals with formal leadership roles should exert leadership, is limited and can readily serve to hinder a school's efforts to implement significant reform. This perspective not only creates huge demands of the formal leader(s), but it can also create a division between the administration and rest of the school staff. The power and authority associated with leadership easily becomes something to fight over instead of something to employ for the improvement of the school. Our perspective is that leadership and power can and should be shared among many formal and informal leaders. In so doing, it becomes possible to move away from an orientation in which power is used primarily as a means of control towards an orientation in which it becomes a source of "productivity" at the school.

One implication of our findings focuses on the need to expand leadership training within schools. Such training is too often limited to administrators, and too often limited in the scope of the roles, activities, or perspectives thought to be critical to effective leadership. Research over the years leads to the ultimate conclusion that leadership is a complex phenomenon and that effective leadership requires constant adaptation to the organizational, political, and external environments. Labels such as "instructional leadership", "democratic leadership", or "transformational leadership" can too easily result in an oversimplification of the definition of the role and a limited perspective on the kinds of activities needed to generate school improvement. The categories of activities comprising the model of developmental leadership studied here are sufficiently comprehensive to cover a significant portion of the leadership activities required in a school and sufficiently broad to allow leaders to tailor their activities and emphases to the requirements of the particular situation in which they are working. Thus, leadership training should focus on generating the breadth of

perspective reflected in this model. It should also strive to insure that individuals throughout the school, including teachers, other members of the staff, and even parents and other stakeholders, become oriented towards taking a leadership role. The demands for leading, managing, and operating schools continue to increase, and an expansion of the leadership role as well as of the human resources devoted to meeting these demands is critical for high levels of school performance.

More research is, of course, needed to fully explore the value of the model of developmental leadership for generating school reform. Our evidence is anecdotal and based on a retrospective analysis of available data. Studies specifically designed to examine these categories of leadership behavior and to evaluate their relationship with the process and outcomes of reform efforts in schools, especially those adopting school-based management, would enhance our understanding of school leadership and the requirements for effective reform. As more and more schools begin to adopt such changes, the nature of the leadership at these schools and the extent to which leadership is shared among a wide range of members is likely to be critical for the success of these reform efforts.

References

- Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Free Press.
- Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper & Row.
- Berlew, D. E. (1974). Leadership and organizational excitement. California Management Review, 17, 21-30
- Bossert, S. T., Dwyer, D. C., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. V. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. Educational Administration Quarterly, 18, 34-64.
- Bradford, D. L. & Cohen, A. R. (1984). Managing for excellence: The guide to developing high performance in contemporary organizations. New York: Wiley.
- Bryson, J. M. & Crosby, B. C. (1992). Leadership for the common good: Tackling public problems in a shared power world. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper & Row.
- Cohen, S. G. (1993). New approaches to teams and teamwork. In J. R. Galbraith, E. E. Lawler, III, & Associates (Eds.), Organizing for the future: The new logic for managing complex organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Collins, J. C. & Porras, J. I. (1989). Making impossible dreams come true. Stanford Business School Magazine, 57 (4), 12-19.
- Collins, J. C. & Porras, J. I. (1994). Built to last: Successful habits of visionary companies. New York: HarperCollins.
- Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. Academy of Management Review, 12, 637-647.
- Cuban, L. (1988). The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Deal, T. E. & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

- Drucker, P. F. (1988). The coming of the new organization. Harvard Business Review, 66, 45-53.
- Fullan, M. G. (1992). Visions that blind. Educational Leadership, 49 (5), 19-20.
- Gladstein, D. A. (1984). Groups in context: A model of organizational effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 29, 499-517.
- Hackman, J. R. (1990). Conclusion: Creating more effective work groups in organizations. In J. R. Hackman (Ed.), Groups that work (and those that don't): Creating conditions for effective teamwork. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hackman, J. R. & Walton, R. E. (1986). Leading groups in organizations. In P. S. Goodman (Ed.), Designing effective work groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hall, G. E. (1988). The principal as leader of the change facilitating team. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 22, 49-59.
- Hallinger, P. & McCary, C. E. (1990). Developing the strategic thinking of instructional leaders. Elementary School Journal, 91, 89-108.
- Hallinger, P. & Richardson, D. (1988). Models of shared leadership: Evolving structures and relationships. Urban Review, 20, 229-245.
- Heck, R. H., Larsen, T. J., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1990). Instructional leadership and school achievement: Validation of a causal model. Educational Administration Quarterly, 26, 94-125.
- Heck, R. H. & Marcoulides, G. A. (1990). Examining contextual differences in the development of instructional leadership and school achievement. Urban Review, 22, 247-265.
- Kouzes, J. M. & Posner, B. Z. (1987). The leadership challenge: How to get extraordinary things done in organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lawler, E. E. (1986). High-involvement management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Leavitt, H. J. (1986). Corporate pathfinders. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Leithwood, K. A. (1992). The move toward transformational leadership. Educational Leadership, 49 (5), 8-12.

- Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American Journal of Sociology, 83, 340-363.
- Mintzberg, H. (1973). The nature of managerial work. New York: Harper & Row.
- Mohrman, S. A. (1993). Integrating roles and structure in the lateral organization. In J. R. Galbraith, E. E. Lawler, III, & Associates (Eds.), Organizing for the future: The new logic for managing complex organizations. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mohrman, S. A., Wohlstetter, P., & Associates. (1994). School-based management: Organizing for high performance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Murphy, J. (1989). The instructional leadership role of the school principal: An analysis. Unpublished manuscript. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, IL.
- Murphy, J. (1994). Transformational change and the evolving role of the principal: Early empirical evidence. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, J. & Beck, L. G. (1994). Reconstructing the principalship: Challenges and possibilities. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational reform efforts. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Peters, T. J. & Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best run companies. New York: Harper & Row.
- Peterson, K. (1986). Vision and problem finding in principals' work: Values and cognition in administration. Peabody Journal of Education, 63, 88-106.
- Pfeffer, J. (1980). Management as symbolic action: The creation and maintenance of organizational paradigms. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), Research in organizational behavior, Vol. 2. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G. R. (1978). The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective. New York: Harper & Row.

- Porras, J. I. & Robertson, P. J. (1992). Organization development: Theory, practice, and research. In M. Dunnette & L. Hough (Eds.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (2nd ed.), Vol. 3. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Reitzug, U. C. (1992). Self-managed leadership: An alternative school governance structure. Urban Review, 24, 133-147.
- Robertson, P. J. & Tang, S. Y. (1995). The role of commitment in collective action: Comparing the organizational behavior and rational choice perspectives. Public Administration Review, 55, 67-80.
- Robertson, P. J., Wohlstetter, P., & Mohrman, S. A. (forthcoming). Generating curriculum and instructional innovations through school-based management. Educational Administration Quarterly.
- Sayles, L. R. (1989). Leadership: Managing in real organizations (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Scott, W. R. (1981). Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Schein, E. H. (1992). Organizational culture and leadership (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results. Educational Leadership, 47 (8), 23-27.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). Why we should seek substitutes for leadership. Educational Leadership, 49 (5), 41-45.
- Short, P. M. & Spencer, W. A. (1990). Principal instructional leadership. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 23, 117-122.

- Siehl, C. & Martin, J. (1983). The role of symbolic management: How can managers effectively transmit organizational culture? In J. G. Hunt et al. (Eds.), Leaders and managers: International perspectives on managerial behavior and leadership. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Smircich, L. & Morgan, G. (1982). Leadership: The management of meaning. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 18, 257-273.
- Tichy, N. M. & Devanna, M. A. (1986). The transformational leader. New York: Wiley.
- Trice, H. M. & Beyer, J. M. (1993). The cultures of work organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Van Maanen, J. & Schein, E. H. (1979). Toward a theory of organizational socialization. In B. M. Staw (Ed.), Research in organizational behavior, Vol. 1. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Wohlstetter, P., Smyer, R., & Mohrman, S. A. (1994). New boundaries for school-based management: The high involvement model. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 16, 268-286.